DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 355 786 FL 021 049

AUTHOR Grundy, Thomas
TITLE ESL/Bilingual Education: Policies, Programs, and Pedagogy.
INSTITUTION Oregon School Study Council, Eugene.
REPORT NO ISSN-0095-6694
PUB DATE Dec 92
NOTE 50p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
JOURNAL CIT OSSC Bulletin; v36 n4 Dec 1992

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Identification; Limited English Speaking; Program Descriptions; School Districts; *Second Language Instruction; *State Programs; Statewide Planning; Teacher Certification
IDENTIFIERS *Oregon

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this bulletin is to examine general policies and principles of English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) education, to assess the status of the ESL program at the state level in Oregon, and to examine ESL programs in two Oregon school districts. The study is concerned with both the quantitative (demography, budget allocations) and qualitative (perception of ESL in comparison with basic academic programs success and sophistication of programs) aspects of the programs. An overview is provided of current statewide policy and local practices to determine major strengths and weaknesses in existing programs. Remedies for weaknesses and models of strengths that districts and schools may follow in maintaining and developing their ESL/limited-English-speaking (LEP) programs are provided. The Bulletin is roughly comprised of two parts. The first deals with problems, theory, and practices of ESL education in general. The second deals with ESL programs and policies in Oregon. Chapter 1 examines marginalization of ESL, and the problems of teacher marginalization and certification. Chapter 2 deals specifically with the principles of ESL instruction, while chapter 3 focuses on the identification and monitoring of ESL students and outlines suggested principles and practices. Chapters 4 through 6 review ESL instruction in Oregon. (VWL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED355786

ESL/Bilingual Education

Policies, Programs, and Pedagogy

Thomas Grundy

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. Pierce
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Oregon School Study Council
December 1992 • Volume 36, Number 4

FL 021 047

OSSC BULLETIN

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ESL/Bilingual Education

Policies, Programs, and Pedagogy

Thomas Grundy

Oregon School Study Council
December 1992 • Volume 36, Number 4

ISSN 0095-6694
Nonmember price: $6.00
Member price: $4.50
Quantity Discounts:
10-24 copies - 15%
25-49 copies - 20%
50+ copies - 25%

OSSC STAFF

Philip K. Piele, Executive Secretary
Stuart C. Smith, Editor
Linda S. Lumsden, Associate Editor and Production
Deborah Drost, Assistant Editor and Production
Audrey Muller, Publications Sales

OSSC GOVERNING BOARD

Mike Cone, School Board Member, Gresham Grade SD 4
Mike Delvin, School Board Member, North Bend SD 13
James Maxwell, Superintendent, Lane ESD
Philip K. Piele, Professor and Executive Secretary, Oregon School Study Council
David Conley, Associate Professor, Division of Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon
Bill Korach, Superintendent, Lake Oswego SD 7J
Bob Stalick, Superintendent, Greater Albany Public SD 8J
Diane Harr, School Board Member, Oregon School Boards Association

OREGON SCHOOL STUDY COUNCIL

1787 Agate Street
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403
(503) 346-5044
Fax: (503) 346-2334

The University of Oregon is an affirmative action, equal opportunity employer.

Preface

ESL education is becoming increasingly important in schools throughout the nation. Not only is the ESL population growing in size but also in the number of languages. Although relegated to secondary status for many years, ESL is emerging as its own discipline, and much time and energy have been spent developing a sound theoretical basis for pedagogy and policy.

The first four chapters of this Bulletin focus on that research. These early chapters outline major concerns in ESL education: theoretical assumptions underlying successful secondary and, to some extent, primary language acquisition; the marginalization of ESL programs; and guidelines for assessing and monitoring ESL students. The final chapters turn to Oregon ESL programs, first looking at ESL at the state level and then turning more specifically to ESL programs in two Oregon school districts.

Thomas Grundy received his B.A. and M.A. in English from California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, and his Ph.D. in English from the University of Oregon, Eugene. He has taught English composition and literature since 1980, and is currently working as an instructor in the English Department at the University of Oregon. He is the author of the October 1986 OSSC Bulletin, *The Writing Program in the Beaverton School District.*

Contents

	Preface	iii
	Introduction	1
1.	**A Marginalized Program? It's a Question of Definition**	4
	Factors Affecting Marginalization	4
	Demarginalizing ESL Programs	6
2.	**Principles of ESL Instruction**	10
	ESL/Foreign Language	10
	Whole English as a Second Language—Theory and Pedagogy	12
	The Sheltered-English Approach	14
3.	**Monitoring the Progress of ESL Students**	17
	Changing Demographics	17
	Federal Monitoring Guidelines	18
	Summary of ESL Principles	20
4.	**Oregon ESL Policies—Then and Now**	22
	ESL Policies in 1988	22
	ESL Policies Today	23
	Two Examples of ESL Programs: A Preview	25
5.	**Eugene Develops a Two-Way Immersion Program**	26
	Policy	26
	Identification, Assessment, and Instruction	27
	Demographics and Staffing	28
	A Developing Program	29

6. **Portland Offers Comprehensive ESL/Bilingual Program** 31
Parent and Community Support 32
Assessment and Demographics 32

Conclusion 34

Appendix A: Competencies for Teaching English as a Second Language (ESL) in Grades K-12 35

Appendix B: Oregon Department of Education's 'ESOL Helpbook' 37

Bibliography 40

Interviews 42

Introduction

The purpose of this Bulletin is to examine general policies and principles of ESL (English as a second language) education, to assess the status of the ESL program at the state level in Oregon, and to examine ESL programs in two Oregon school districts. *Status* is a slippery word with several meanings, including "the makeup or nature of," "the standing of," and "the quality of." In trying to ascertain the status of ESL programs, we are concerned not only with quantitative aspects, such as demographics or budget allocations, but also with qualitative aspects, such as the perception of ESL in comparison with basic academic programs, or the sophistication and success of ESL/LEP (limited English programs).

This Bulletin will not attempt a complete survey or study of ESL programs in Oregon; it will provide an overview of current statewide policy and local practices to determine their major strengths and weakness. Remedies for weaknesses and models of strengths that districts and schools may follow in maintaining and developing their ESL/LEP programs are provided.

ESL programs should be based on sound theory and practice. Drawing on a large body of research, Mary E. Smith and John F. Heflin suggest that policies and principles for educating ESL students should follow the guidelines proposed by the Contextual Interaction Theory:

> The five basic principles of the Contextual Interaction Theory describe how student input factors interact with instructional treatments to contribute to the three major goals of educational programs for language minority students: (a) English language proficiency, (b) academic achievement, and (c) psychosocial adjustment. (California State Department of Education 1982)

The five principles are:

1. For bilingual students, the degree to which proficiency in both L1 (primary language) and L2 (second language) are developed is positively associated with academic achievement.

2. Language proficiency is the ability to use language for both academic purposes and basic communication tasks.

3. For language minority students, the development of the primary language skills necessary to complete academic tasks forms the basis for similar proficiency in English.

4. Acquisition of basic communicative competency in a second language is a function of comprehensible second language input and a supportive effective environment.

5. The perceived status of students affects the interactions between teachers and students and among students themselves. (California State Department of Education 1982)

This Bulletin focuses on certain concerns that grow out of these five principles: the importance of L1 (first or primary language) proficiency, content-area emphasis, and cultural validation as primary means to achieve effective ESL education. Gloria Muniz, specialist in bilingual/migrant education for the Oregon Department of Education, makes the important point that ESL is only a component of the Equal Educational Opportunity Program. The ultimate goal for ESL students is not English language acquisition but academic success. English language proficiency is a prerequisite for academic success. L1 proficiency aids not only in L2 (second language) proficiency but in the acquisition of knowledge and mastery of content areas; content-area mastery is essential for academic success. As the California State Department of Education's (1990) *Bilingual Education Handbook* states:

> Vital language skills and thinking processes can be most efficiently acquired in the home language, then applied to English, because language learning occurs holistically and builds upon previous cognitive gains. In his landmark work in this area, Professor James Cummins introduced the term *common underlying proficiency* to describe the large body of literacy skills and thinking strategies which, once mastered in the primary language, provide a sound basis for rapid acquisition of similar skills in a second, third, or any number of languages.

Indeed, academic growth is largely dependent upon primary language mastery:

> There is a crucial point to keep in mind: A student's eventual proficiency in English depends largely on the degree of literacy he or she attains in the primary language. If there is little support for primary language development at home or school, the LEP student will probably never progress beyond rudimentary conversational skills in *any* language.

Content-based instruction is important if ESL students are to remain on a par academically with their English-speaking peers:

> English proficiency and academic ability are distinct aspects of a student's learning profile. Just because he or she cannot speak English does not mean a student belongs in a deficit or remedial program. To the contrary, restricting an individual's learning opportunities to a low-level, skills-based curriculum devoid of challenging content virtually guarantees that an empowering command of English will not be achieved.

Hence, there is a need for content-based primary language instruction. Cultural validation is needed for students' self-esteem and psychosocial adjustment. It is a way to effect equal status for ESL students.

This Bulletin is comprised of roughly two parts. The first part—chapters 1 through 3—deals with problems, theory, and practices of ESL education in general. The second part—chapters 4 through 6—focuses on ESL policies and programs in Oregon.

Chapter 1 examines marginalization of ESL before turning to ways of correcting it. The chapter focuses more precisely on the specific problems of teacher marginalization and certification, concluding with a brief discussion about overcoming student marginalization.

Chapter 2 deals more specifically with the principles of ESL instruction. Beginning with a brief comparison of ESL and FL (foreign language) instruction, this chapter examines second-language acquisition and instruction from the perspective of the whole-language approach to teaching. The specific ESL pedagogical methodology of "sheltered English" instruction is also examined.

Chapter 3 focuses on the identification and monitoring of ESL students and outlines the suggested principles and practices suggested by Federal Monitoring Guidelines published in 1992. The chapter ends with a general overview of effective principles for ESL programs and instruction.

Chapters 4 through 6 review ESL in Oregon. Chapter 4 focuses on state policy and the last two chapters on specific school districts. Chapter 5 examines the relatively small program still in its developmental stages in the Eugene School District. The major focus is on development of a two-way immersion program that demonstrates the application of some of the best ESL/bilingual theory and practice. Chapter 6 highlights the large and well-developed ESL program of the Portland School District. The program is very comprehensive and offers a fine model for identification and tracking of ESL students.

Chapter 1

A Marginalized Program? It's a Question of Definition

English as a second language (ESL) programs are often relegated to second-class status. ESL students have limited English proficiency (LEP). Both ESL and LEP are often pejorative acronyms. The students are seen as remedial and candidates for special education classes. ESL teachers are not considered to be at the same level as "regular" teachers. The marginality of ESL teachers and students remains a significant problem in today's educational arena. Indeed, the battle seems to be heating up.

> A fact of life for ESL educators is that we are marginalized: college ESL instructors are often hired as adjunct faculty on a semester basis to teach non-credit preparatory courses in academic skills centers. Elementary ESL teachers teach in pull-out programs, traveling from school to school and setting up shop in closets, corridors, and basements. Adult educators teaching survival ESL have to work two or three jobs in order to survive; jobs with benefits, living wages, and any measure of security are few and far between. (Elsa Roberts Auerbach 1991)

Certainly not a pretty picture, and it is much worse for postsecondary ESL teachers than for elementary and secondary teachers. In community and four-year colleges, a large number of teachers are part time and/or nontenured faculty as a matter of budgetary expediency. ESL teachers are not unique in this except that they are often denied tenure as a group.

Factors Affecting Marginalization

It is important to realize that marginalization occurs in different forms. Mark A. Grey (1991), drawing on the research of Janet Mancini Billson, defines the three types of marginality:

1. *Cultural marginality*—hierarchical groupings that create, reject, and isolate out-groups.

2. *Social role marginality*—doctors are more valued than chiropractors, adults more than children.

3. *Structural marginality*—political, social and economic powerlessness of certain disenfranchised and/or disadvantaged segments within societies.

Grey remarks, "all three of these types of marginality are relevant to consideration of marginal immigrant education programs." Both ESL teachers and students suffer from lower status.

Grey outlines six factors contributing to the marginalization of ESL programs. First, there is a "lack of previous experience on the part of both teachers and administrators" in many ESL secondary programs. Regular teachers, who are not trained to teach ESL, teach ESL students. "An absence of requirements or opportunities for certification in ESL education in many states also contributes to poor instruction and ambivalent feelings towards ESL programs," Grey contends. The major administrative problem is that ESL programs "are often initiated as experiments" but lack sufficient control factors and the "theoretical or experiential basis for appropriate development." Moreover, "the goals and objectives for ESL programs and their students are usually unwritten—if established at all—allowing for any given number of interpretations."

The second marginalizing factor is that assimilation is "a one-way process in which the outsider is expected to change in order to become part of the dominant culture" (Grey). Essentially, although (or because) the primary goal of ESL programs is to teach language-minority students English, a byproduct of prioritizing English is a devaluation of the minority language and minority culture. Grey makes the political argument that "Americans *want* immigrants to be marginal to some extent." He cites the "peer buddy system" as an exception to marginalization practices but points out that its goal is still assimilation that is largely one way into the mainstream world rather than contact for the mainstream student with the ESL scene. To demonstrate the lower status of ESL students and the problem of one-way assimilation, Grey offers a comparison between ESL and foreign- exchange students:

> While immigrant students usually appear without forewarning, exchange students are invited into the school environment, and their presence is encouraged by the community and school administrators. These foreign exchange students are brought into the school to provide mainstream students with glimpses of another culture, and interaction between established-resident students and exchange students is openly encouraged. This is no doubt influenced in many

> cases by the fact that exchange students are usually members of the middle or elite classes in their home countries, and immigrants are representative of poor or working classes.

In other words, the cultural otherness is celebrated in foreign-exchange students but discouraged in immigrant students. Making the acquisition of English the primary goal for transitional bilingual-education programs and mainstreaming students into English-only classrooms as quickly as possible undermine the academic and social development of the language-minority students by devaluing development and proficiency in their own language and not stressing the child's overall academic success (Grey).

The third factor is lack of empathy from teachers, administrators, and students. It is very difficult for most of us to fit into a new and foreign environment. The problems of culture shock and the length of time for adjustment to a new environment will vary. Those of us who have not experienced a foreign culture may lack understanding about the difficulty of adjusting to cultural demands. Alienation, confusion, and embarrassment are commonly experienced while adjusting to a foreign culture.

The last three factors contributing to marginality cited by Grey are more politically charged: the myth of the melting pot, the English-only movement, and the continuing need for a labor underclass. Grey argues that the melting pot "did not take place," that the metaphor itself "reinforces assimilationist attitudes towards secondary ESL programs," and that the dominant culture and not cultural diversity is celebrated. The English-only movement essentially sees cultural diversity as a threat to our cultural integrity—diversity implies fragmentation. Immigration is as feared as it was at the turn of the century.

Grey rightly argues that "the recruitment of LEP immigrants to fill jobs disdained by most Americans has taken place at least since the turn of the century," and he is certainly correct to state that "inadequate ESL programs help maintain a labor underclass by not properly preparing LEP students to advance their cultural careers."

Demarginalizing ESL Programs

Overcoming the problems of marginalization seems to be a matter of cultural validation—seeing cultural diversity as a potential strength rather than a threat. ESL programs and school districts can educate their communities and work for changes in state and national policy. Within the schools, teachers and administrators can establish programs and practices that celebrate minority-language cultures, thereby improving the chances for the academic success of language-minority students.

The first three factors that Grey states have contributed to marginalization (see the previous section) are more easily addressed pragmatically and pedagogically from within the school district. The latter three influence the way one approaches ESL instruction and require a broader philosophical and ethical reorientation.

The melting-pot myth and English-only movement raise issues of direct concern to us: cultural validation and primary-language proficiency. A hypothesis of the Contextual Interaction Theory is that a supportive affective environment and an improvement in the perceived status of the students contribute to second-language acquisition. Moreover, students are more likely to acquire a second language if they are helped to improve their proficiency in their primary language. In other words, cultural validation and primary-language proficiency are important factors in achieving the three primary goals of ESL education: proficiency in the English language, academic achievement, and psychosocial adjustment. The melting-pot myth and the English-only movement, by encouraging one-way assimilation and discouraging cultural diversity and primary-language development, are counterproductive to quality ESL education.

Certification and Teacher Status

Attempts are being made to change the perception of the low status of ESL teachers and to raise their status. The current president of Oregon TESOL, Ronald Parrish, identified what he considered to be the two major problems facing ESL programs and teachers in Oregon: the lack of a teacher-certification requirement for ESL teachers and the marginal status of ESL teachers. These two problems are interdependent. James Dean Brown (1992) notes that the "issues of respect, employment, and funding" were three major areas of concern identified in a recent survey of TESOL members. The lack of respect for ESL teachers was coupled with a failure to see ESL as a valid area of academic expertise:

> For many teachers, the issue of respect appears to be linked to the erroneous notion that anybody who happens to be an English native speaker can teach ESL. One respondent put it this way: "Just because you speak English, doesn't mean you can teach ESL." Another commented that the biggest problem is a "lack of professional respect within institutions—'anyone who speaks English can teach English'." One other person suggested that the single biggest problem was "credibility—other professionals realizing that speaking English does not equal teaching English." (Brown)

Or, as another respondent said,

> The biggest problem is: lack of prestige within one's institution.

> Positions are nontenured at the college level. Teachers are not certified and sometimes untrained, especially in the adult ed ESL field; public school ESL teachers often have no training or experience and have been riffed or godfathered into ESL positions. (Brown)

Without certification requirements, ESL tends to be viewed as remedial education, a steppingstone on the teacher's career path toward a more important position:

> The official rationalization for our marginal status is that ESL is a skill, not a discipline; we're preparing students to do something other than learn English. There's an academy with an established set of standards, and our job is to get people ready to enter it. As such, our work is defined more as training than educating; language is seen as a neutral tool, a set of decontextualized standards to be mastered as a precondition for access. And the academy congratulates itself for opening its doors by offering training to the masses. (Auerbach)

ESL educators need special skills and knowledge just like those in other disciplines, and certification is one way ESL teachers can achieve equal status.

California, a leader in ESL education, is among the states requiring ESL certification. The California TESOL organization (CATESOL) fought the battle to get ESL recognized as a discipline. After supporting a bill requiring teachers to hold a master's degree or equivalent in their discipline, CATESOL was successful in convincing "the community colleges that ESL should be listed as a separate discipline with its own qualifications." The organization also "developed what it considered to be the minimum qualifications for teaching ESL in a community college" (Denise Murray 1992).

Before ESL teachers can achieve equal status among their already legitimized colleagues who teach in other academic areas, it seems necessary for ESL to be recognized as its own legitimate discipline. Accomplishing this will encourage certification of ESL teachers to teach ESL classes at the very least.

According to Donna Lane, assistant commissioner of the Oregon State Board of Education, Oregon state policy has a budgetary focus allowing institutions of higher education (IHEs) to collect FTE (full-time equivalency) reimbursement for their ESL students. As previously stated, there is no certification requirement for ESL teachers in Oregon. This is true for elementary, secondary, and higher education. For institutions of higher education, policy differs from school to school, though colleges usually require a master's degree.

Coordination of ESL programs between elementary and secondary schools and IHEs is not conducted in a systematic way by the Oregon Department of Education but is performed mainly by the professional

organizations TESOL and ORTESOL. Particularly when it comes to the debate over teacher certification and the status of ESL teachers, ORTESOL has often been at odds with state policy and practices. CATESOL has developed a rather detailed outline for ESL teacher competency that should be useful as a model for Oregon and other states to follow (see Appendix A).

Student Status

Redefining ESL programs may help eliminate the problem of one-way assimilation caused by cultural biases and ethnocentrism. It may be best to think of ESL students as foreign-exchange students. Let these students teach majority-language students about their culture and language. Bilingual education will then work more favorably for both minority- and majority-language students, as it does in two-way immersion programs. Focusing on getting to know language-minority students rather than on trying to change them may increase our empathy toward them and encourage others to see them as members of a valued culture.

It is probably best to think of ESL students as language-minority students and assume their role: If you were in a country whose language you did not speak, you, too, would be a language-minority student.

Chapter 2

Principles of ESL Instruction

There are many similarities between instruction in ESL and instruction in any foreign language. Thinking of bilingualism (not just English proficiency) and academic success as the preferred ends of ESL education may help reduce marginalization of the student and increase the status of the ESL teacher. Both ESL and foreign-language instruction share many of the theories and practices of whole-language instruction. These principles can be specifically applied in the "sheltered-English" classroom emphasizing content-area mastery along with second-language acquisition.

ESL/Foreign Language

When thinking of ESL students as language-minority students, it may also be useful to think of the ESL teacher as a foreign-language teacher teaching the foreign language of English. As the California State Department of Education (1989) states in its *Foreign Language Handbook*:

> In the beginning stages of instruction, strategies for teaching English as a second language resemble those used to teach foreign languages. Both strategies are similar in that they are organized around the goals of communicative proficiency and cultural understanding and a commitment to teaching and learning through the target language. In addition, in both strategies an early emphasis on using language for survival and basic living is viewed as a method of developing more sophisticated communication skills.

Despite the many similarities, there are significant differences that must be taken into account: English is the specified, not chosen, language of instruction, and it is the language of the country in which nonnative speakers now reside.

The *Foreign Language Handbook* provides a useful outline of specific points that should be addressed in ESL instruction. Instruction in English:

1. Is required for those assigned to such instruction and is not an elective
2. Is taught in the surroundings of the target-language culture, in contrast to foreign language instruction
3. Is developmental in nature, not remedial
4. Is not the same as instruction in English as a foreign language, which is taught in a non-English speaking society to relatively homogeneous groups of learners
5. Is flexible enough to meet widely varying student needs
6. Is a long-term process, usually requiring three to five years for students to reach adequate proficiency in English
7. In the beginning stages of instruction, focuses primarily on life skills of immediate concern and reflects a strong sense of urgency for students to learn to function in school and in society as rapidly as possible
8. At later stages of instruction, focuses on subjects in the school's core curriculum, including advanced literacy for the different levels of proficiency of English
9. Includes coordinated, articulated instruction in the areas of listening, speaking, reading, and writing and incorporates the subskills of grammar, vocabulary, and phonetics
10. Is carefully integrated and coordinated with the core curriculum of the school
11. Features planned cocurricular and extracurricular experiences facilitating positive student interaction with native speakers of English
12. Often includes students who must be taught basic learning and literacy skills
13. Features careful assessments of students before they are assigned to appropriate classes within the system and levels within the class until they progress beyond classes in English as a second language
14. Provides for continuing assessment of progress and follow-up services

There are two separate issues that need further treatment: the affinities with the whole-language approach to teaching ESL, and the need for monitoring the progress of ESL students.

Whole English as a Second Language—Theory and Pedagogy

California ESL Instructional Guidelines illustrate the interconnection between ESL instruction and the whole-language approach to language instruction. Indeed, certain principles for sound ESL instruction are founded upon the same assumptions that underlie the whole-language approach. Drawing on current research, Janet A. Norris and Jack S. Damico (1990) observe:

> A review of the rationale underlying the various holistic assessment and instruction trends occurring in language arts, bilingual education, foreign language learning, and other areas of language reveals the same basic theoretical construct. This construct is based upon the assumption that language is an *integrated system* that is componentially complex, not the sum of fragmented component parts.

Two important implications for "structuring assessment and intervention" arise from this perspective:

> First, from a practical standpoint, language is not viewed as an independent system. It is closely linked with other representational and cognitive abilities and it is influenced by nonlinguistic variables such as motivation, experience, learning, and anxiety.
>
> Second, language itself is an integrated system. Each language component (e.g., phonology or syntax) or each one of the processes noted in language use (e.g., listening, speaking, reading, or writing) are closely interrelated. The individual components or processes cannot change without affecting and being affected by the other components or processes.

Norris and Damico outline four principles that "are inherent in the integrated construct of language that is the foundation of the whole language movement":

1. Language exists for the formulation, comprehension, and transmission of meaning.
2. All of the components of language (phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics) are simultaneously present and interacting in any instance of language use. . . . Language is not learned by first acquiring the smallest component parts and gradually adding more complex parts.
3. Language use always occurs in a context or situation, and that context or situation is critical to meaning creation. The more repeatable and predictable a context is, the more it facilitates language learning.
4. Whole-language views learning as an active constructive process rather than a passive one. Each individual must "create"

> knowledge through interactions with the physical and social environment. Learning language is a complex cognitive process that involves incorporating new information into existing knowledge in a dynamic manner.

Based on these principles, effective whole-language instruction involves the student in an active learning process: the dynamic communicative process involving reading, writing, listening, thinking, speaking. As Norris and Damico remark, "current research indicates that children do not learn language in order to articulate correctly or speak well-formed sentences, but rather to derive meaning and accomplish purposes."

We use language for:

> *Transitional functions*—to accomplish goals, to inform or persuade
> *Expressive functions*—to reflect on and explore experience
> *Poetic functions*—for creative expression (Norris and Damico)

Pedagogical approaches that encourage the interactive communication of meaning among students and teachers will be more effective than approaches that fragment learning and dictate blocks or discrete items of information.

To provide the meaning and context within which students can learn language more effectively, Norris and Damico argue for a theme-building strategy incorporating two general principles of learning: first, that we move from a general to a specific understanding of a concept or event; and second, that "learning occurs from the most familiar context or concept to the least familiar." Hence, repetition is important because,

> as an event becomes more familiar and routine, schemata develop for these objects, actions, and roles, so that the ability to function efficiently increases. The familiarity of the event enables children to become more independent and to talk about the things that they see or are using.

Theme building is an attractive teaching tool because it allows for a multiplicity of approaches and variations within a recurring ideational framework:

> Theme building makes use of recurring ideas and events that are common to the theme, and allows for multiple formats (art, pictures, play, literature, drawing, storytelling, dance, snacks, discussion and so forth) to be used to develop and express ideas related to the theme. Theme building allows for transactional, expressive, and poetic language functions to be expressed. By maintaining the same theme across activities and across days, weeks, or even months, the child has the time and the opportunity to attain familiarity with the information and to begin to refine his/her understanding to include very specific knowledge. This meaning embedded process results in greater language development.

Whichever instructional method is chosen, it is important to remember that the child should be an active participant in the learning process, not a passive receiver of data. Norris and Damico speak of the importance for an adult to provide "opportunities for language to be produced" and to use techniques that "enable children to be active participants," thereby involving them in leadership and decision-making roles. Much of what has been said here falls under the subject of communication-based activities in the *Foreign Language Handbook* (California State Department of Education 1989):

> In communication-based instruction, information is conveyed or messages are exchanged naturally during the learning process. Students participating in communication-based activities have a purpose for communicating and attach personal significance to the content.

The handbook provides a table of comparison between communication-based activities and manipulative activities. Also included are two tables illustrating the difference between the Mechanistic and the Relational paradigms. These latter two tables more fully illustrate the difference between the two methods of instruction.

The Sheltered-English Approach

The sheltered-English approach incorporates many of the concepts and practices presented earlier. As Lorraine Valdez Pierce (1988) explains in her discussion of the principles of sheltered English,

> Sheltered English is an approach to teaching ESL that uses English as the medium for providing content area instruction. It serves as a bridge between the ESL class and the academic mainstream. This approach differs from what native speakers of English receive in their regular all-English program (subject matter instruction in English) in that Sheltered English provides content area instruction to LEP students while emphasizing development of their English language skills.

She says, the "learning of curricular subjects and English occur simultaneously," but "the focus on instruction and testing (evaluation) is on the subject matter itself, not on the language." Sheltered English is particularly important and useful because, along with English-language proficiency, it is aimed at content-area instruction to allow ESL students to develop academic competence so they do not fall behind their native-English-speaking peers (Freeman and Freeman 1988).

Sheltered English is based on the sound theoretical framework of Jim Cummins and Stephen Krashen, says Pierce:

Research conducted by these two linguists deals with theoretical underpinnings of first language development and second language acquisition and of the interaction between both of these and school achievement.

The concept of Sheltered English arose from the work of Stephen Krashen (1985), whose idea that language is learned when it is delivered as "comprehensible input" set the foundation for the development of English language classes which provide content area instruction in a limited, controlled, or "sheltered" format. For input to be comprehensible, it must contain language and vocabulary already known to the student and must be acquired in meaningful contexts or situations (as opposed to language drills and exercises which focus on reinforcement of grammatical structures instead of meaning). Sheltered English also includes the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills and English language skills which enable students to learn content area material through the medium of English.

Freeman and Freeman point out that "sheltered English programs may be either bilingual or monolingual, but English instruction is the key element in both." They describe a model developed by Marilyn Weinhouse and Stephen Krashen that includes three elements: "sheltered English instruction, primary language instruction, and mainstream English instruction."

Ideally, first-language instruction should continue throughout the student's academic career, though this is not always possible due to lack of resources.

Among the pedagogical principles Pierce cites are the use of multiple formats such as those used in theme building, the use of a controlled vocabulary, and comprehensible (simplified, slower) lessons that are interesting and relevant. Freeman and Freeman provide the following list of methods commonly used in sheltered-English classes:

- *Extralinguistic cues* such as visuals, props, and body language
- *Linguistic modifications* such as repetition and pauses during speech
- *Interactive lectures* with frequent comprehension checks
- *Cooperative learning strategies*
- *Focus on central concepts* rather than on details by using a thematic approach
- *Development of reading strategies* such as mapping and writing to develop thinking

The focus is on the four language skills, and extralinguistic cues and audiovisual equipment are used to "promote comprehension" and to further the clarification of meaning (Pierce).

Techniques common to process writing, such as brainstorming, are also used. Process writing is an effective and important tool in the Sheltered English classroom. In her useful, hands-on guide, *Integrating Language and Content Instruction: Strategies and Techniques*, Deborah J. Short (1991) remarks,

> Process writing, though initially implemented in language arts classes, is easily extended into content-area classes. As with all process writing exercises, students begin with pre-writing activities such as viewing a film or sharing the reading of an article that sets the stage for the content area topic. The class may also review key concepts and vocabulary to incorporate into the writing. During the process, the students learn about language—specific to the content topic selected—in a meaningful and motivating manner.

Process writing integrates the four language skills: students read about a topic, listen to and participate in discussion about the topic, and write about it. Throughout the process they are involved in critically thinking about the topic.

Chapter 3

Monitoring the Progress of ESL Students

There have been important demographic changes in ESL student populations in the United Sates and Oregon. Schools are faced with increasing numbers of both ESL students and of minority languages. Methods of identifying and monitoring the progress of language-minority students are needed to provide them equal educational opportunity and so help ensure their academic success.

Changing Demographics

One of the first steps toward establishing an ESL/LEP program is an analysis of the demographic makeup of schools and school districts. Demographics in Oregon are undergoing important changes. A forum sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (1990) reported findings that should be seriously considered when setting goals and policies for Oregon schools:

1. Local education agencies (LEAs) are experiencing significant increases, both in the total number of LEP students and in the number of languages represented.
2. Increases in the number of LEP students are occurring even in school districts with declining enrollments.
3. Many students of all ages are entering school with limited or no previous schooling in addition to the inability to speak English.

The forum noted that the rapid increases in the number of LEP students is compounding the existing problem of staff shortages in bilingual/ESL programs. The forum's report cited concerns about: (1) locating and training certified teachers to work with LEP students, (2) retaining ESL/

bilingual staff, and (3) retraining monolingual teachers in schools districts where budgetary constraints prohibit the hiring of trained bilingual/ESL staff.

The forum recommended ways to help alleviate the increasing problems with staffing:

1. Streamline ESL/bilingual personnel certification requirements.
2. Involve the private sector in promoting the educational success of LEP students.
3. Increase the dialogue among elementary/secondary and postsecondary education agencies and the U.S. Department of Education.
4. Disseminate information about effective and promising practices in the field of bilingual/ESL education.
5. Encourage school principals to fully integrate bilingual/ESL education staff into the school program.

Federal Monitoring Guidelines

In 1992, the Council of Chief State School Officers published its recommendations for a national policy regarding the assessment and monitoring of ESL/LEP students to ensure that they have the same opportunities for educational success as their native English-speaking peers. The council's report establishes definitions and guidelines for state and district policy.

The recommendations of the council follow some of the same principles emphasized in the preceding chapters: the need for proficiency in both primary and secondary languages, the need for content-area instruction, and the emphasis on whole-language theory.

> The major goal of language assistance programs is to help students from a language background other than English develop sufficient English proficiency skills to allow them to succeed in English-only classes. Simultaneously, such programs should ensure that these students continue to learn and expand their knowledge of new content and therefore do not fall behind their peers whose native language is English. Another important goal of these programs is to promote the development of proficiency in the native, non-English language. (Council of Chief State School Officers)

Further, the council defines and determines language proficiency in terms of the four modalities that whole language focuses on:

> In determining language proficiency, school personnel must assess all four language skills (speaking, reading, writing and understanding/ listening) because these skills affect the appropriate placement of children in learning environments. A student can be competent in one or more of these skills, but not in all.

As the council points out, these language skills contribute to proficiency in the following ways:

- *Reading*—the ability to comprehend and interpret text at the age- and grade-appropriate level
- *Listening*—the ability to understand the language of the teacher and instruction, comprehend and extract information, and follow the instructional discourse through which teachers provide information
- *Writing*—the ability to produce written text with content and format fulfilling classroom assignments at the age- and grade-appropriate level
- *Speaking*—the ability to use oral language appropriately and effectively in learning activities (such as peer tutoring, collaborative learning activities, and question/answer sessions) within the classroom and in social interactions within the school

More specifically, assessment and monitoring should take place in various stages, be inclusive for all students, and be ongoing to ensure that students are not misplaced in English-only classrooms and do not fall behind once they are mainstreamed. There should be an initial screening to identify all LEP students. The screening should probably include a home-language survey to determine the native language and the student's proficiency in that language. This survey should be "standardized both within and across state lines" and should be followed up with "full home environment surveys" (Council of Chief State School Officers).

Assessment occurs in three stages: assessment for *classification*, for *placement*, and for *monitoring academic progress and reclassification*. Assessment for classification should include all four language skills: reading, listening, writing, and speaking. The tests should be "based on sound psychometric practice and theoretically based research," and should include an assessment of primary-language proficiency (Council of Chief State School Officers). Assessment for placement should also include an assessment of primary-language proficiency:

> Students are often inappropriately placed or they are identified as intellectually inferior because their performance on English-language achievement tests or other content tests is reduced by their limited understanding of the language. Without native, non-English language testing or assessment in content areas, it is difficult to determine the extent of content knowledge of children with limited English proficiency.

Achievement test scores should not be used in isolation. These tests should be used in conjunction with other assessment methods (other tests, structured interviews, for example) to help determine a student's capabilities.

Assessment for monitoring academic progress and reclassification is important for a variety of reasons. As the council states, "the fact that a student reaches preset criterion levels does not ensure that he or she will succeed in regular classes." The council thus suggests a redefinition:

> Generally, reclassification means that the student leaves the language-assistance program. However, reclassification should mean changing the *nature* of the language-assistance services received by LEP students, and that services will be continued or restarted if the student needs them.

This redefinition can be particularly important with respect to funding. If a student is no longer identified as ESL/LEP, he or she may no longer be entitled to additional funding by the state or district. This stipulation, says David Arlington, specialist for humanities and foreign languages for the Oregon Department of Education, is often a problem in Oregon. If an ESL student has been mainstreamed, he or she may no longer be counted as an ESL student and so may not be entitled to the additional 0.5 FTE allocated to Oregon ESL students. (This matter is discussed in more detail later.).

According to the Council of Chief State School Officers, "services for LEP students should represent a continuum of appropriate programs, not be dichotomous (i.e., provided or not, based on entry or exit requirement)." The monitoring phase should include annual testing for academic progress. Moreover, "the exit process should require (a) multiple criteria (such as tests, portfolios and writing samples), (b) performance of the student at grade level and (c) a level of achievement comparable with that of FEP students."

Summary of ESL Principles

Effective ESL education should include at least the following principles and procedures:

- Primary-language proficiency
- Full English proficiency to allow ESL students to perform academically at the same level as their peers who have English as their primary language
- Cultural validation
- An emphasis on the academic success of ESL students
- Equal status with other programs—ESL should be seen as developmental and not remedial
- Content-based instruction (subject area)
- Communication-based instruction (pedagogical methodology)

- An emphasis on all four areas of language competency: reading, writing, speaking, and listening
- The utilization of the Federal Monitoring Guidelines (or something similar) for identification, assessment, and monitoring procedures
- The recognition that some/many ESL students will need additional, different, or continued language assistance even after meeting preset criterion levels

In addition, the involvement of groups outside the school environment helps facilitate the academic success of ESL (and other LEP and at-risk) students. Schools should encourage the participation of families, the private sector, and the community as a whole, as well as make use of available resources offered by local, state, and federal agencies.

It is important to realize that each language-minority group has a different view of the appropriate level of involvement in their children's education. For example, as Lynn Balster Liontos (1992) remarks, the "idea of parents being involved in schools is completely counter to Southeast Asians' beliefs." Whereas Southeast Asians "hold teachers in high esteem," many Afro-American parents, because of the United States' long "history of racism and discrimination, may simply view school 'as a necessary evil, mandated by law but clearly outside the family's control or best interest—just like all other social services'."

Chapter 4

Oregon ESL Policies—Then and Now

One way to assess current ESL programs and practices is to compare them with past programs and practices. This chapter begins with a brief discussion of a 1988 study of Oregon ESL policies and then characterizes state policies today to see how the state has corrected or dealt with programs identified four years earlier. Although the 1988 study was not commissioned by the state, it did identify needs and problems in ESL policy at the state level.

ESL Policies in 1988

The first, and so far only, study "to document ESL/bilingual education policies statewide [in Oregon] and to analyze them in terms of their propensity to provide equal opportunity to language minorities" was undertaken by Mary E. Smith and John F. Heflin in 1988. The fact that the first statewide study was not done until 1988 seems to indicate the low priority and status of ESL/bilingual programs in Oregon.

First of all, there was no statewide policy or standard for ESL programs. District school boards adopted their own written policies, but as Smith and Heflin remark, "one of the most notable findings in this study was the lack of frequency that district policy was mentioned as the basis for implementing ESL/bilingual practices in the schools." Because of the lack of statewide policy and clear mandates at the district level, there was a loss of continuity and quality in ESL instruction:

> In the absence of written district policy, standard operating procedures imply de facto policy, under which most Oregon districts appear to be operating, according to their responses. This study found that policies

> and procedures are implemented, according to the majority of respondents, because they are considered educationally effective. Apparently the standard of what practices are educationally effective is based on the perception of the ESL/bilingual program director of each district, rather than research-based principles, or state and federal laws. In the absence of a clear statewide policy by which to interpret laws . . . there is a wide variation in the quality of instructional services for language minority students.

In addition to the inconsistency and apparent ineffectiveness of much district policy, Smith and Heflin listed two other major findings. First, "although the majority of districts are in apparent compliance with most of the questionnaire items relating to the law, very few districts appear to meet all requirements necessary to comply with each law at the federal and state levels." Second, the district policies did not reflect or institute effective pedagogical theory and practices for ESL students: "The correlation between school districts' ESL/bilingual education policies and basic principles for effectively educating language minority students is very low."

Ultimately, Smith and Heflin concluded "that the impact of ESL/bilingual policies as implemented in a majority of Oregon school districts is failing in many important respects to provide equal educational opportunity to language minority students."

ESL Policies Today

State policy on ESL remains very general and not very helpful in providing specific guidelines for the implementation of programs or plans at the district and school levels. Policies are largely statements of principle about what should happen. The Oregon Administrative Rules and Oregon Revised Statutes are less broad and more useful. The Administrative Rules essentially serve as state guidelines for implementing plans, but the plans themselves remain the responsibility of the individual districts. For example, Oregon law ORS 326.051 "requires access to a quality education be provided for all of Oregon's youth regardless of linguistic background, culture, race, gender, capability or geographic location." Oregon Administrative Rule 581-22-505 is more specific on how this is to be done. It "requires district boards to adopt written policies and maintain plans and programs which assure equal opportunities for all students." Local school boards are responsible for the specifics of these plans.

To ensure that districts are in compliance with both state and federal laws for equal educational opportunity for language-minority students, Oregon follows a standardization program. The state board conducts "standards visits" to fifty districts per year to ensure that, among other things, the districts have adopted written policies and maintained plans and programs for

ESOL students. The state also conducts workshops to aid districts in the development of their individual ESOL plans.

Although there should probably be a clearer correlation between state policy and the Administrative Rules, the broadness or generality serves a useful purpose in encouraging flexibility among the districts. There are significant differences in demographics, resources, and needs among the districts, and flexible policies help ensure that varying needs are met.

To further assist teachers, schools, and districts in providing a quality education for ESOL students, David Arlington and others have prepared the *ESOL Helpbook*. A model of brevity and clarity, the *ESOL Helpbook* is extremely useful to ESOL teachers and administrators, particularly to those new to the field. Indeed, it has served as a model for similar books in other states and for programs outside the U.S.. The *Helpbook* answers two questions of fundamental importance: "What do I have to do when I get students who don't know English?" and "Where can I get help?"

The first part of the booklet explains how to go about meeting the four basic responsibilities of the ESOL educator: (1) identify the students, (2) assess their language ability, (3) provide them with transitional help to English, and (4) return them to regular classes as soon as they're ready. The second part of the *Helpbook* identifies where you can go for help, from your local school district, to your community, to your county, to other places in Oregon, to other places in the United States. The same format can easily and usefully be adopted by other states and countries.

The *Helpbook*, although not a guideline for an ESL program, also provides a brief summary of important state and federal laws, and Oregon statutes and rules. Finally, the last few pages give a demographic table showing 134 out of 296 school districts in Oregon. This table is important for a couple of reasons beyond basic demography. It provides a networking device for school districts. Find a district that is similar to your own and call them. Information in the table provided major impetus for the Oregon legislature to revise the funding formula for ESOL students. Because of the efforts of David Arlington and others, ESOL students receive an additional 0.5 FTE (or ADM) per student to help meet the greater needs of the ESOL population. The *ESOL Helpbook* is available from the Oregon Department of Education, 700 Pringle Parkway SE, Salem, OR, 97310.

Although progress has been made in ESL education in Oregon over the last few years, much remains to be done, particularly at the state level. What emerged from Smith and Heflin's study remains true today. There is a need for:

1. A clear statewide ESL/bilingual policy that can be used to interpret laws. This should also include a statement of policies and principles for educating ESL/LEP students.

2. Clearly written district policies in all districts. These should follow the statewide policy and be implemented throughout the individual districts.

3. State and district policy should follow "policies and basic principles for effectively educating language minority students."

It seems necessary for the state to establish a separate department for ESL/bilingual education. Currently there is an ESL program coordinator at the postsecondary level but none for K-12. The federal specialist on ESL/bilingual education operates solely with federal funding without assistance from the state.

Two Examples of ESL Programs: A Preview

The two remaining chapters focus on ESL programs in the Eugene Public Schools and the Portland Public Schools. An attempt will be made to identify each district's compliance with OAR 581-22-505 and OAR 581-21-046, the rules requiring districts to adopt policies and plans ensuring an equal opportunity for minority students. OAR 581-22-505 "requires district boards to adopt written policies and maintain plans and programs which assure equal opportunities for all students"; OAR 581-21-046 "requires districts to develop and implement a plan for identifying students whose primary language is other than English and to provide such students with appropriate programs until they are able to use the English language effectively in regular classroom instruction and other educational activities" (Oregon Department of Education).

After assessing the status of written district policy, each chapter will provide a general overview of the nature of the district's ESL program, the ESL teacher and student populations, and how ESL students are identified, monitored, and mainstreamed. Each chapter will conclude with a discussion of some outstanding aspects of the district's program. It is hoped that other districts will be provided with ideas and models to use in developing and improving their own ESL programs.

The Eugene school district is an example of a relatively small program in the process of developing its ESL policies. The district is coordinating its efforts with a local university and the private sector to apply sound theory and practice as it implements a bilingual program at one of its schools.

Portland has a large, well-established ESL program that demonstrates efficiency and expertise in all levels of its multileveled, comprehensive program. It provides a very useful model for identifying, tracking, and monitoring ESL students.

Chapter 5

Eugene Develops a Two-Way Immersion Program

The ESL program in Eugene Public Schools is both under development and in transition in terms of its program offerings and assessment/monitoring procedures. Currently, the district lacks a formal, written ESL policy. However, working in conjunction with the University of Oregon and community members, the district's ESL office established a committee last fall whose goal was to improve ESL instruction. The committee succeeded in establishing a new ESL teacher/facilitator position and has developed plans for a sheltered-English program and a two-way immersion program. This two-way immersion program is still in the planning phases, and the district hopes to implement it, pending school board and interdisciplinary council approval, in 1993. The plans for the program draw on sound theory and practice to develop the language skills of, and to ensure content-area instruction for, language-minority students while providing foreign language instruction for native English-speaking students.

Policy

The school district has a formal written policy on nondiscrimination, but it is based largely on national origin and race. David Piercy, assistant to the superintendent, explains that the written ESL plan is budgetary in nature. Although there is no written plan for identifying language-minority students or for providing them with appropriate ESL programs, the district certainly follows the spirit of the rules that require districts to provide equal opportunity for language-minority students. Board Policy Statement 5205 on Nondiscrimination states in broad terms that "the Board believes that all students have the right to expect and receive an equal chance to benefit from the best

educational program the district can provide." Although school board members believe all students should be protected from discrimination, language-minority students are not mentioned in the catalogue of discriminatory areas. *Discrimination* is defined as

> any act that unreasonably differentiates treatment, intended or unintended, or any act that is fair in form but discriminatory in operation, either of which is based on handicap, national origin, race, religion, sex, or socioeconomic-economic status.

The district believes and demonstrates in its practices that ESL students must have special training in English if they, too, are to "receive an equal chance to benefit from the best educational program the district can provide" and so succeed academically, but the policy statement itself does not include this specificity. District practice, however, is another matter. The district systematically identifies, assesses, and provides ESL instruction for language-minority students. In addition, the district provides teachers with a student-teacher guide for ESL that outlines the program and provides useful "instructional suggestions for working with second language learners."

Identification, Assessment, and Instruction

According to Namihira Bolton, the bilingual/ESL coordinator, the schools are responsible for identifying language-minority students, referring them to the district, and asking for assistance. The district assesses the students. As of last year, all the ESL students have been screened using the Language Aptitude Scale and rated as Non, Limited, or Fluent English Proficient. Even though administering the test is very time consuming, the district will try to test all the elementary students again next year. The goal is to test all ESL students every year. The district is just beginning to record specific data on students' progress in the content areas of math and science, and is currently in the process of creating a report form for the schools that will make reading the test results more meaningful and useful to the teachers. The report will include both student scores and a copy of the test.

After being identified, each student spends a half hour to one hour each day (two to three days each week in elementary schools) with a teacher or an aide. Classes remain small, with as few as four or five students, to allow for intensive instruction and attention from the teacher. If the class size reaches ten or so, the teacher is provided with an aide so that quality instruction is not sacrificed. More specifically, instruction at the various levels is as follows:

- *Kindergarten.* No pullout ESL services. Five or more students in a classroom = 1/2 hour per day aide time in classroom.

- *Grades 1-6.* Pullout one-half hour to one hour two to three days a week. Additional support via training and material offered to classroom teachers.
- *Middle School/High School.* ESL class one period per day.

Demographics and Staffing

Student demographics in Eugene have remained relatively stable over the past few years. The distribution of minority-language students has changed over the last decade or so from an Asian-dominant to a Hispanic-dominant ESL population (see sidebar).

Twenty-one countries are represented, the largest being Mexico (57 students) followed by Korea (17) and Japan (14). The ESL population is concentrated in the elementary schools (76 students as opposed to 56 in middle and high schools combined) and is spread out over twenty-two schools in the district.

To teach 132 ESL students, the district employs two full-time, certified teacher/coordinators, one each at the elementary and secondary levels. They are assisted by two half-time certified staff and nine part-time classified staff with varying ethnic backgrounds.

ESL teachers attend a monthly meeting to share ideas and strategies and to collaborate with "regular" teachers for problem assessment. Twice each year, two teacher workshops are held (one during the day and one at

Eugene's ESL Student Population

Total Students Served		132
Elementary	76	
Middle	18	
High	38	
Total Schools Served		22
Elementary	15	
Middle	3	
High	4	
Males		68
Females		64
Total Countries Represented		21

	Number of Students	Percent of Total
Mexico	57	43
Korea	17	13
Japan	14	11
China	6	4
Taiwan	8	6
Vietnam	5	4
Venezuela	4	
Philippines	3	
Marshall Is., Norway, Russia, Sweden, U.S.	2	
Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Laos, Liberia		1

night to accommodate differing schedules) to train and help non-ESL teachers to understand and work with the problems and needs of LEP students. Next year, the district will fund a new ESL teacher/facilitator position. This person will work with ESL/LEP students as well as train ESL and "regular" teachers to work with ESL/LEP students.

ESL teachers, perhaps because of the extra needs of their students, are particularly selfless, sometimes making home contacts, leading field trips, and even going so far as to help the families find apartments. At the end of the year, teachers and students are invited to an awards ceremony where friendships are renewed and the closeness of the group is celebrated. In 1991-92, the district began what will be an annual event—the ESL Celebration—to validate and celebrate cultural diversity.

A Developing Program

Currently, the program can be characterized as ESL. Language-minority students are taught English without their native language being taught or proficiency in that language being stressed. The district is in the process of implementing a sheltered-English program where English is used in content areas, such as math or social studies, and lesson plans are focused on a controlled vocabulary and a few main concepts. There is a partial immersion program in foreign languages where English-speaking students learn either French, Spanish, or Japanese. In the Spanish program, all content areas except English literature are taught in Spanish.

Now the district is planning to implement an innovative bilingual program—the two-way immersion program—that will provide Spanish-speaking students with the same opportunities as their English-speaking counterparts in the foreign-language partial immersion program.

In a traditional bilingual program, the goal is to teach language-minority students to learn English. In the two-way immersion program, the goal is for all language-minority and language-majority students to learn two languages. Each group of students benefits from the other. What is particularly needed for such a program to succeed is well-trained personnel—good teachers who have excellent skills in both languages or team teachers who divide the languages among them. Dual-language instruction may take place on the same day, on alternate days, or in alternate semesters.

As Robert Hemenez, a University of Oregon teacher and researcher explains, the plan establishes the two-way immersion program at one school in the district wherein half the students will be native English speakers and the other half native Spanish speakers (Spanish is the largest minority language in the district). The program seeks to achieve three goals or benefits.

First, the language-minority student occupies a role in which her language is valued. Thus, both languages are on equal terms. This is important because language is tied to identity and self-esteem. For example, if Spanish is devalued or accorded lesser status, it is common for the student to avoid speaking Spanish at home. As the California State Department of Education's *Foreign Language Handbook* notes, among the various advantages to be gained from such a course, the minority-language "students' self esteem is often raised when they are given a chance to increase their competency in a language spoken at home (and when they realize that competency is valued by a respected educational institution)." In the two-way immersion program, the Spanish student will learn that Spanish is important. For at least part of the day, the language-minority student will have the status of majority language.

Second, these kinds of programs have been very effective in promoting second-language acquisition by the language-majority student. In a traditional transitional bilingual program, a separate room is established where the teacher uses both languages for instruction. All students are of the same language group and are exposed to second-language linguistic models (their peers) only during such times as recess or lunch. The two-way immersion program eliminates this problem because students of both linguistic groups are continually working together and reinforcing each other's language.

Third, in traditional bilingual programs, which are often viewed as remedial or compensatory by educators and the public, overall academic achievement is often low even when English-language proficiency improves. In the enrichment program, however, English-speaking students are recruited from middle-class, mainstream, English-speaking backgrounds; parents of these students demand and usually get a quality education. In this program, the language-minority students enjoy the same level of status as their English-speaking peers. The goal is not remedial education but mutual enrichment. Both groups benefit from this redefinition.

While providing ESL students with instruction in English, the Eugene school district stresses three major areas needed for their academic success: primary-language proficiency, content-area instruction, and the validation of the ESL student's own culture. The two-way immersion program will help the Spanish-speaking students develop their primary-language proficiency as well as validate Spanish as a status language. The sheltered-English classes stress content-area instruction while assisting in the development of English-language proficiency. The ESL night and other cultural activities celebrate cultural diversity and help make the students feel welcome and a part of the community.

Chapter 6

Portland Offers Comprehensive ESL/Bilingual Program

The Portland Public Schools has a well-developed, written ESL policy. The policy covers all the areas for maintaining a good and effective ESL program—identification, assessment, instruction, community support, even vocational training—and evinces a strong commitment to sound ESL theory and practice. The district, perhaps because of its larger size and the comprehensiveness of its program, offers support to districts with small ESL populations that do not have the resources to research and develop a comprehensive program. The following breakdown of staff positions is evidence of the program's comprehensive support: teachers, 101; educational assistants, 52; community agents, 22; clerical, 7; administrators, 7; specialists, 9; social workers, 1; psychologists, 1.

In an overview of services, the district states:

> The primary service provided by the program is instruction in English, accompanied whenever possible by bilingual assistance in content areas (math, social studies, science and other subjects). These direct instructional services are offered in all 38 Program schools across the District.

As is evident from this statement, the district focuses on the areas of major importance for ESL education—bilingual education and primary-language proficiency—and stresses content-area development to encourage the academic success of language-minority students. English-language instruction addresses the four modalities of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Sheltered-English classes are used to increase both English-language skills and mastery of content areas.

Offering primary-language study whenever "bilingual staff is available," Portland's program incorporates bilingual instruction and tutoring from pre-K through grade 12, going beyond content-area emphasis to encourage intercommunication among students, staff, parents, and community:

> Bilingual paraprofessionals provide tutoring in content areas plus assistance in cultural adjustment, native literacy, and liaison with school staff and parents.

Instruction and integration begin soon after the arrival of the minority-language family in the community. Centers have been established for newcomers that "provide intensive English, primary language literacy and orientation to the new school and society." These centers operate year-round for grades 3-8 and begin in the second quarter for grades 9-12.

Parent and Community Support

Moreover, the district encourages parental support and community involvement. An ESL/Bilingual Parent Agency Advisory Council sponsors many activities aimed at making ESL families part of the community, including: "primary language parent groups, local school open houses, home visits, interpreters for parent conferences and translated school-to-home communications" (Portland Public Schools). For the largest of the language-minority populations, resource specialists give students and families "cultural, social, and academic support." Job-preparation classes are also offered in three high schools to provide interviewing and job skills for exiting students and for students who may need a part-time job while attending high school.

Assessment and Demographics

Assessment occurs not only in English but in second-language proficiency and math. For ESL students who have special needs, the Child Study Team offers "pre-referral consulting services" that may include "observation, collaboration with teachers on possible interventions, formal and informal assessment, and parent involvement." Demographic information on ESL students is collected monthly through class lists via teachers, paraprofessionals, and other staff. These data are collected centrally and entered into the district computer for quick and efficient collating. The information is thus up-to-date and comprehensive.

Portland has experienced a dramatic increase of ESL students from fewer than 600 in 1976-77 to 3,151 in June 1992. Table 1 gives a breakdown of primary languages or primary language groups in the district. There is not only a growth in the number of ESL students in the district, but also a growth

in the number of languages spoken. Identifying the changes in the ESL population allows the district to assess current and future needs. For example, the three major language minority groups today are Vietnamese, Spanish, and Russian. Other Southeast-Asian language groups comprise a large portion of the ESL population. Because of the size of these popula-

Table 1: Distribution of ESL/Bilingual Student Population According to Ethnic Groups—1986 to 1992

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992
Vietnamese	637	562	521	554	581	719	777
Spanish	114	95	105	157	279	399	509
Russian	1	0	0	62	381	538	708
Mien	188	194	132	159	108	129	147
Lao	192	193	211	209	181	156	132
Hmong	166	143	133	137	117	122	113
Cambodian	172	138	157	148	119	87	97
Other	397	430	541	621	476	672	668
Total	1876	1755	1800	2047	2242	2822	3151

Figures are reported for April, May, or June of the years given.

tions, the district determined the need for targeting funds for Southeast Asian, Hispanic, and Russian resource specialists. Because of the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the number of Russian students has increased the most—from none in 1987-88 to 708 in June 1992.

Portland Public Schools offers an ESL/bilingual program that is comprehensive and based on sound research and practices. The program demonstrates a commitment to primary-language proficiency, to content-area instruction, and to cultural validation, particularly in its efforts to reach out to the language-minority populations and bring them into the community and schools. The district is generous in reaching out, not only to the language-minority population within the district, but to other districts as well. In its identification of ESL populations, it is exemplary. Its collection and collation of demographic data for ESL populations offers an excellent model for other districts to emulate.

Conclusion

Oregon needs to institute a state-level, written policy establishing guidelines for ESL education. This policy should clearly delineate the theoretical basis upon which ESL programs are based. First, as research indicates, the theoretical base should include, at a minimum, an emphasis on primary-language proficiency, content-based instruction, English-language proficiency, and cultural validation. The California State Department of Education's *Bilingual Education Handbook* and *Foreign Language Handbook* provide useful models.

Second, the state should standardize methods of identification, assessment, and monitoring of ESL students. The federal guidelines recommended by the Council of Chief State School Officers suggest a sound methodology. Third, the state should work to develop the minimum qualifications for certification of ESL teachers. This step will not only help to ensure quality ESL education, but will afford the state the additional opportunity of coordinating efforts between and among local education agencies and institutions of higher education.

The Eugene Public Schools offers an example of a coordinated effort with a local university; an integrated, sound theory; and movement toward effective practice in its ESL program. The planned two-way immersion program demonstrates how ESL education can become bilingual education by viewing language-minority students as assets rather than liabilities. Diversity becomes a welcomed educational resource.

Portland Public Schools is an example of a district that has developed a comprehensive ESL program, also based on sound theory and practice. Moreover, it offers a model for how the state and other districts can go about developing an assessment and monitoring system for its ESL students. Given the rapidly changing demographics of ESL students, such a system is particularly important for assessing the funding and staffing needs of individual schools and districts. Testing and monitoring—in primary language, content areas, and secondary language—are needed to ensure the educational development of language-minority students. After all, the ultimate goal of ESL is not English-language proficiency, but the academic success of ESL students.

Appendix A

Competencies for Teaching English as a Second Language (ESL) in Grades K-12

CATESOL, a professional organization concerned with the teaching of English as a second or foreign language, standard English as a second dialect, and bilingual education, affirms that language is a major source of individual, personal and cultural identity since it is central to intellectual development and socialization plus basic to learning and concept formation. Consequently, CATESOL recommends the following competencies as essential for teachers of LEP students in grades K-12.

Competencies Related to Knowledge about Language

A. Understanding the major theories underlying the analysis of language structures:
- phonetics/phonology
- morphology/syntax
- semantics
- pragmatics
- discourse/rhetoric

B. Ability to analyze English for teaching purposes:
- sound system
- word formation and syntactic systems
- meaning systems
- use of language appropriate to a variety of situations

C. Ability to analyze the interrelationship between:
- spoken and written English
- English and the students' primary languages
- language and thinking

Competencies Related to Knowledge about Language Acquisition and Learning

A. Understanding the psychological factors that affect first and second language acquisition and use:
- cognitive development
- affective variables
- interlanguage
- input and monitoring
- memory
- language development and disorders
- bilingualism

B. Understanding the social, cultural and economic factors which affect first and second language acquisition and use:
- language variation: standard language, register, roles, etc.
- societal attitudes toward language
- language contact, shift, and maintenance

Competencies Related to Teaching English as a Second Language

A. Understanding and evaluating historical and contemporary approaches and methods

B. Ability to vary curricula depending on the language needs of non-native English speakers:
- English language development
- survival English
- sheltered English or ESL in content areas
- academic English
- vocational and career English

C. Ability to teach for communicative competence in listening, speaking, reading, and writing:
- comprehension and interactive listening

- pronunciation, intonation, stress, and rhythm
- literacies and the reading process
- the writing process

D. Ability to integrate listening, speaking, reading, writing, and creative and critical thinking in instruction

E. Ability to evaluate and adapt prepared materials and to create supplementary materials

F. Ability to assess the language and learning of non-native English speakers:
- using holistic and discrete point instruments
- evaluating, administering, and interpreting diagnostic, achievement, and proficiency assessment instruments
- preparing classroom tests

G. Ability to facilitate small group instruction and to manage peer tutors, aides and volunteers.

Competencies Related to Knowledge about Culture

A. Ability to function cross-culturally through:
- effective interaction with ethnolinguistic minorities
- recognition of the effects of prejudice and stereotyping
- sensitivity to interrelationships between culture and verbal and non-verbal communication
- knowledge of the historical and contemporary status of linguistic minorities in California

B. Understanding how relationships between language and culture shape:
- thinking
- learning styles and preferences
- attitudes
- motivation
- perception

C. Understanding how the immigrant experience affects:
- the process of learning to function in a new culture
- readiness for second language acquisition
- learning in a school setting

D. Ability to integrate the culture and experiences of students into approved curricula frameworks

Approved by the CATESOL Board of Directors June 11, 1989.

(Reprinted by permission of CATESOL)

Appendix B

Oregon Department of Education's 'ESOL Helpbook'

The following organizations offering assistance and information on ESL programs are taken from the *ESOL Helpbook*. The *Helpbook* is available free of charge in either paper copy or on computer disk from:

David Arlington, Specialist
Foreign Languages & International Programs
Oregon Department of Education
700 Pringle Parkway SE
Salem, OR 97310-0290
Phone: (503) 378-3602
Fax: (503) 373-7968

To order a copy on computer disk (Macintosh or MS-DOS), send a formatted, blank disk and a self-addressed, postage-paid envelope to the address above.

The organizations listed below can provide information and assistance for establishing an ESL program.

COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES can help with classes for college-bound students and adults; both public and private institutions offer courses on demand, sometimes specialized programs to prepare students for the transition from high school to college or university; here are some (for others, see entry for ORTESOL)

American English Institute
University of Oregon
Room 107, Pacific Hall
Eugene OR 97403
Phone 346-3945 Fax 346-3917
Jacquelyn Schachter, Director

English Language Institute
Oregon State University
Snell Hall 301
Corvallis OR 97331
Phone 737-2464 Fax 737-0871
Allen Sellers, Director

ENNR Program
Portland State University
PO Box 751
Portland OR 97207 Phone 725-408
Kimberley Brown, Coordinator

English Language Study Center
Western Oregon State College
300 N Stadium Drive
Monmouth OR 97361
Phone 838-4375 Fax 838-4476
Michael Sudlow, Director

American Language Academy
Southern Oregon State College
1250 Siskiyou Boulevard
Ashland OR 97520 Phone 552-6196
Amy Lepon, Director

Inst for the Study of Amer Lang & Culture (ISALC)
Lewis & Clark College
LC Box 125
Portland OR 97219
Phone 768-7310 Fax 768-7320
Joann Geddes, Director

ESL Program - International Program
Melrose Hall
Linfield College
McMinnville OR 97128
Phone 472-4121 x503
Sandra Lee, Coordinator

English Language Institute
Pacific University
UC Box 661
Forest Grove OR 97116
Phone 357-6151 x2296
Brad Maxfield, Director

American Language Academy - Portland
University of Portland
5000 N Willamette Boulevard
Portland OR 97203-5798
Phone 283-7449
Susan Reilly, Director

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ELS Language Center
Willamette University
900 State Street
Salem OR 97301-9989
Phone 373-3303 Fax 373-3394
Gunnar Gundersen, Director

OREGON TEACHERS OF ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES (ORTESOL) can help members (and others) with newsletters, conferences, etc.; write or phone:

Sharon Hennessy, President
ORTESOL
2114 SE 52nd
Portland OR 97215
Phone 236-0660 or 244-6111 x3908

MIGRANT EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER (MESC) AREA & DISTRICT OFFICES can help with many services, including language and records transfer, if the students are eligible migrants; there are 23 programs statewide with administrative offices in Beaverton SD; Central SD, Clackamas ESD, East Multnomah Co; Forest Grove SD, Hillsboro Elem SD, Hillsboro UHSD, Hood River Co SD, Jackson ESD, Jefferson Co SD, Klamath Co SD, Klamath Falls SD, Lake ESD, Marion ESD, North Plains SD; Nyssa SD, Ontario SD, Portland SD, The Dalles SD, Umatilla ESD, Wasco Co; Woodburn SD, Yamhill ESD; write or phone:

Joseâ Garcia, State Coordinator
Migrant Education
Oregon Department of Education
700 Pringle Parkway SE
Salem OR 97310-0290
Phone 378-3606 Fax 373-7968

Merced Flores, Director
Migrant Education Service Center
Administration Building 2nd Floor
700 Church Street SE
Salem OR 97301-3714
Phone 378-6853 Fax 373-7418

INTERFACE MIGRANT PROGRAM COORDINATION CENTER can help coordinate inter/intrastate activities upon request to state and local educational agencies participating in migrant education program and projects; activities include workshops, seminars, regional institutes, and consultations in the areas of parental involvement, early childhood education, second language issues, ESL in the content areas, and information dissemination; write or phone:

Nilda Garcia Simms, Director
Interface Migrant Program Coordination Center
4800 SW Griffith Drive Suite 202
Beaverton OR 97005
Phone 800-234-4330

BILINGUAL MULTIFUNCTIONAL RESOURCE CENTER can help with technical assistance and training to local education agencies participating in bilingual education programs (Title VII teacher training, parent education, curriculum development, program evaluation design and student assessment); write or phone:

Esther Puentes, Director
Bilingual Multifunctional Resource Center
4800 SW Griffith Drive Suite 202
Beaverton OR 97005
Phone 644-5741

INTERFACE DESEGREGATION ASSISTANCE CENTER can help with technical consultation and training to state and local education agencies in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of desegregation plans; provides training in race, sex equity, and national origin (state and federal requirements, parent involvement, conflict resolution, student achievement, high intensity language training, bias in language, language acquisition, disparity in classroom interactions, etc.); write or phone:

Miquel Valenciano, Director
Interface Desegregation Assistance Center (DAC)
4800 SW Griffith Drive Suite 202
Beaverton OR 97005
Phone 644-5741

OREGON MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION (OMEA) can help with conflict resolution and multicultural instruction/curriculum; write or phone:

Dapo Sobomehin, President
Oregon Multicultural Education Association (OMEA)
PO Box 40749
Portland OR 97240-0749
Phone 230-2378

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE CENTER OF OREGON (IRCO) can help with many services, including its International Language Bank, for interpretation and translation in at least 14 languages: Vietnamese, Cambodian, Lao, Hmong, Mien, Cantonese (Chinese), Korean, Romanian, Farsi (Persian), Tigrinya (Ethiopian), Spanish, Polish, Russian, Japanese, others as needed; write or phone:

International Refugee Center of Oregon
International Language Bank
1336 E Burnside Street
Portland OR 97214
Phone 234-0168 business;
24-hour hotline 234-0068

COLUMBIA EDUCATION CENTER (CEC) can help as facilitator for the National Diffusion Network which recognizes exemplary programs throughout the nation; write or phone:

Ralph Nelsen, Director
Columbia Education Center
11325 SE Lexington
Portland OR 97266
Phone 760-2346

WORLD CULTURES INSTITUTE (WCI) can provide ESOL and American culture classes for college-bound students and adults through the Center for English Language Studies; specialized programs for specific groups and training for businesses and agencies wanting cross-cultural orientations through the Center for Foreign Language Studies; write or phone:

Heather Emberson, PhD, Director of Administration
World Cultures Institute
135 NW 25th Street
Corvallis OR 97330
Phone 752-5940; Fax 757-7646

OREGON LITERACY can help with a variety of materials and suggestions; write or phone:

Oregon Literacy Inc (Laubach)
9806 SW Boones Ferry Road
Portland OR 97219
Phone 244-3898; Fax 244-9147

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (ODE) can help by arranging for services and by providing limited materials on language and culture; for questions on Title VII bilingual programs and refugee funds, write or phone:

Jerry Fuller, Associate Superintendent
Division of Student Services
Oregon Department of Education
700 Pringle Parkway SE
Salem OR 97310-0290
Phone 378-5585; Fax 373-7968

For questions on national origin or special education for ESOL students, write or phone:

Gloria Muniz, Specialist
Migrant/Special Education (address above)
Phone 378-3606; Fax 373-7968

OUTSIDE OREGON

TEACHERS OF ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES (TESOL) can help members (and others) through publications and conferences; write or phone:

TESOL
1600 Cameron Street Suite 300
Alexandria VA 22314
Phone 703-836-0774; Fax 703-836-7864

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS (CAL) can help with information on teacher training and research related to second language learning; also with a broad range of publications; develops and disseminates language test materials; the Refugee Service Center (RSC) provides materials on refugee cultures and teaching refugees; write or phone:

Center for Applied Linguistics
1118 22nd Street NW
Washington DC 20037
Phone 202-429-9292; Fax 202-659-5641

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS (ERIC/CLL) can help with information on bilingualism and bilingual education, English as a second or foreign language education (for both commonly and uncommonly taught languages), intercultural communication, and child language acquisition; write or phone:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics
Center for Applied Linguistics
1118 22nd Street NW
Washington DC 20037
Phone 202-429-9292; Fax 202-659-5641

NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE ON LITERACY EDUCATION (NCLE) can help with information on literacy education for limited-English-speaking adults and out-of-school youth including training and coordination between various organizations serving these populations; write or phone:

National Clearinghouse on Literacy Education
Center for Applied Linguistics
1118 22nd Street NW
Washington DC 20037
Phone 202-429-9292; Fax 202-659-5641

NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION (NCBE) can help with information related to the education of language minority students through publications, bibliographies, newsletters, research, etc.; a project of the George Washington University and the Center for Applied Linguistics; write or phone:

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education
1118 22nd Street NW
Washington DC 20037
Phone 800-321-NCBE or 202-467-0867; Fax 202-429-9766

Bibliography

Auerbach, Elsa Roberts. "Politics, Pedagogy, and Professionalism: Challenging Marginalization in ESL." *College ESL* 1, 1 (March 1991): 1-9. EJ 432 951.

Billson, Janet Mancini. "No Owner of Soil: The Concept of Marginality Revisited on Its Sixtieth Birthday." *International Review of Modern Sociology* 18 (Autumn 1988): 183-204.

Brown, James Dean. "The Biggest Problems TESOL Members See Facing ESL/ EFL Teachers Today." *TESOL Matters* 2, 2 (April/May 1992): 1.

California State Department of Education. *Basic Principles for the Education of Language Minority Students: An Overview*. Sacramento, California: Author, 1982.

_____. *Bilingual Education Handbook: Designing Instruction for LEP Students*. Sacramento, California: Author, 1990.

_____. *Foreign Language Handbook*. Sacramento, California: Author, 1989.

Council of Chief State School Officers. *Recommendations for Improving the Assessment and Monitoring of Students with Limited English Proficiency*. Washington D. C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, State Education Assessment Center, Resource Center on Educational Equity, 1992.

Cummins, James. *Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy*. San Diego: Chicago Hill Press, 1984.

_____. "Empowering Minority Students: A Framework for Intervention." *Harvard Educational Review* 56, 1 (February 1986): 18-36. EJ 330 827.

_____. "The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting Educational Success for Language Minority Students." In *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework*. 3-39. Los Angeles: California State University Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, 1981.

Cummins, James, and M. Swain. *Bilingualism in Education: Aspects of Theory, Research and Practice*. London: Longman, 1986.

Freeman, David, and Yvonne Freeman. "Sheltered English Instruction." *ERIC Digest*. Washington D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, 1988. ED 301 070.

Grey, Mark A. "The Context for Marginal Secondary ESL Programs: Contributing Factors and the Need for Further Research." *Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students* 9 (Fall 1991): 75-89. EJ 439 694.

Kagan, Spencer. *Cooperative Learning Resources for Teachers.* Riverside, California: Spencer Kagan, 1985.

Krashen, Stephen. *Insights and Inquiries.* Hayward, California: Alemany Press, 1985.

Langer, Judith A., and Arthur N. Applebee. "Learning to Write: Learning to Think. *Educational Horizons* 64, 1 (Fall 1985): 36-38. EJ 324 887.

Liontos, Lynn Balster. *At-Risk Families & Schools: Becoming Partners.* Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1992. ED 342 055.

Murray, Denise. "Making It Happen: An ESL Professional Organization's Advocacy for Teachers and Learners." *ELT Journal* 46, 1 (January 1992): 92-95. EJ 437 862.

Norris, Janet A., and Jack S. Damico. "Whole Language in Theory and Practice: Implications for Language Intervention." *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools* 21, 4 (October 1990): 212-20. EJ 420 017.

Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language affairs. "Staffing the Multilingually Impacted School of the 1990s." Proceedings of the National Forum on Personnel Needs for Districts with Changing Demographics, Washington D.C.: Author, 1990. 27 pages. ED 335 423.

Oregon Department of Education. *ESOL Helpbook.* Salem, Oregon: Author, 1992.

Pierce, Lorraine Valdez, Comp. "Facilitating Transition to the Mainstream: Sheltered English Vocabulary Development." *Program Information Guide Series Number 6.* Wheaton, Maryland: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1988. 20 pages. ED 299 826.

Parker, D. "Sheltered English: Theory to Practice." Paper presented at inservice workshop, San Diego, California, 1985.

Shanklin, Nancy L. "Whole Language and the Writing Process: One Movement or Two?" *Topics in Language Disorders* 11, 3 (May 1991): 45-57. EJ 428 633.

Short, Deborah J. *Integrating Language and Content Instruction: Strategies and Techniques.* Washington D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1991. 30 pages. ED 338 111.

Smith, Mary E., and John F. Heflin. "An Analysis of ESL/Bilingual Education Policy in Oregon School Districts." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 5-9, 1988. 47 pages. ED 296 588.

Weinhouse, Marilyn Morse. *Sheltered English: A Study in the San Diego Unified School District.* Available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Springifield, Virginia. 92 pages. ED 270 995.

Interviews

Arlington, David, Specialist for Humanities and Foreign Languages, Oregon Department of Education. Telephone interviews, August 12 and August 20, 1992.

Bolton, Namihira, Bilingual/ESL Coordinator, Eugene Public School District. Telephone interviews, August 18 and August 21, 1992.

Durgan, Darlene, Assistant Director, ESL/Bilingual Program, Portland Public School District. Telephone interview, August 20, 1992.

Gerston, Russel, Professor, University of Oregon. Telephone interview, August 26, 1992.

Hemenez, Robert, Researcher, University of Oregon. Telephone interview, August 21, 1992.

Lane, Abbey, Teacher, Eugene Public School District. Telephone interview, August 28, 1992.

Lane, Donna, Assistant Commissioner, Oregon State Board of Education. Telephone interview, August 07, 1992.

Munez, Gloria, Specialist, Migrant/Special Education, Division of Student Services, Oregon Department of Education. Telephone interview, September 3, 1992.

Piercy, David, Assistant to the Superintendent, Eugene Public School District. Telephone interview August 21, 1992.

Ronald W. Parrish, President, ORTESOL, Telephone interview, August 6, 1992.

Oregon School
Study Council
University of Oregon
1787 Agate Street
Eugene OR 97403

Nonprofit
Organization
US Postage
PAID
Eugene OR
Permit No. 63

OSSC BULLETIN